AN ANTIDOTE

Againſt ſome

ERRONEOUS PAMPHLETS

Publiſhed of late, to the ſuppreſſion of God's Truth; Which are mentioned in this Treatiſe.

By THO. GERY, *B. D.* and. Miniſter of Gods Word at *Barnwell* in *Leiceſter-ſhire*.

BIBL. CANT. ACAD.

Beloved, believe not every ſpirit, but try the ſpirits, whether they are of God; becauſe many falſe Prophets are gone out into the World. 1. John 4. 1.

LONDON,
Printed by *T. W.* for the Author, 1656.

ERRATA.

IN the Title, read *Barwell.* Pag. 9. lin. 9. read *neglect.* 11. 11. as he is a Saviour of all men. 16. 4. clauſe. 19. 16. body. 28. 1. *Quum.* and in lin. 32. apply. 30. 12. about them. 32. 4. he becomes. 41. 22. not.

The ſubject of this ſhort Treatiſe is a diſcuſſion and deciſion of ſix Controverſies in Religion.

1. Controverſie.

About Gods election of men to eternall life and ſalvation; whether or no it be grounded upon the fore-ſight of their faith and obedience

2. Controverſie.

About the univerſality of Chriſts redemption

3. Cottroverſie.

About the power of Mans Free-will

4. Con-

4. Controversie.

About the merit of good works

5. Controversie.

About original sin

6. Controversie.

About Tithes

A Preface to the Reader.

HAving a pamphlet accidentally put into my hands, twisted of inconsequences, incongruities, and misapplications and depravations of holy Scripture; entituled (*The order of causes. Of Gods foreknowledge, election and predestination; and of mans salvation or damnation*) I thought I might do a charitable work to detect the impostures of it; Especially considering, that it had gotten some entertainment with some persons within my own charge and cure. For albeit there be little hope of prevailing with these false teachers (in these times especially, which have so long connived at their erronious and seditious courses) to renounce their errours, though never so fairly and fully confu-

ted; as who have resolved to hold the [illegible] whether the premises be true or false: (which every Novice in Logick knowes to be an absurdity to be hissed at) yet may this detection of their fallacies in some measure prevent the further diffusion and spreading of their pernitious errours; which is the sole end, wherefore these plain ensuing lines were hastily compiled and penned. And in this regard the courteous Reader is intreated to vouchsafe a candid & benevolent construction of them; as which, upon more Mature deliberation, might either have been kept private, or appearing in publick, might hapily have been clad in a more sightly dresse: which is the humble request of

A friend and servant to all that follow the truth in love.

THOMAS GERY

An Antidote againſt ſome erroneous Pamphlets divulged and publiſhed of late, to the ſuppreſſion of Gods truth: And more particularly againſt the frivolous, incongruous, and erroneous diſcourſe of one Mr. Henry Haggar, *penned and publiſhed in* 1654. *entituled,* The order of cauſes. Of Gods foreknowledge, Election and Predeſtination, and of mans Salvation or Damnation. *To be ſold at the ſeven ſtarrs in* Pauls-*Church-yard.*

IT hath ever been the artifice and deceitfull dealing of Hereticks, to pick out ſome ſuch Texts of Scripture, wherewith to cloak their errours, as by their falſe interpretation of them (in not comparing them with other Texts of Scripture treating of the ſame ſubject) might afford ſome colour and countenance unto them.

Thus the old Serpent (the firſt deviſer of this fallacy) dealt with our bleſſed Saviour, when he tempted him in the Wilderneſſe, he alledged a peice of Scripture out of *Pſalm* 91. 11. where its ſaid, *He ſhall give his Angells charge over thee, to keep thee*, and skipps over the next words, *in all thy waies*, and ſo goeth to the 12 *verſe*, as knowing that the words which he left out, would quite alter the Text from that purpoſe for which he alledged the ſame. And thus deal the Hereticall Sectaries and Separatiſts that are of late ſtarted up; They alledge ſome ſayings of Scripture, which (conſidered by themſelves without any reference had to other Texts of Scripture, which afford light to the right mean-

ing of them) seem at the first superficiall veiw of them, to speak something for them, about some of their erroneous Tenents; whereas compared with other sayings of Scripture, where the same point is more fully and plainly expressed, they make nothing at all for proofe of that for which they are alledged, as shall be discovered in some particulars in this ensuing Treatise.

Amongst a Pardle of their palpable and prodigious Errors (some whereof are utterly unworthy the refutation, being manifest contradictions of holy Scripture; As their denial of Faith to be the gift of God; which I have heard to proceed out of the mouth of divers of no small esteem amongst them with incredible impudence) I have here undertaken the confutation of these 6 (of which some are Popish) which I find in the forenamed booke, and in another which I shall hereafter mention.

1 They affirme, *That Gods election of men to salvation, is from his foresight of their Faith and Obedience. Or* (as some of them phrase it) *from his foresight of their Sanctification and Good Works.*

2 *That Christs Redemption is universall, extending it self to all men in the world,* indiscrimmatim, *indifferently.*

3 *That men have Free will to repent and believe, and so may be saved if they will.*

4 *That Good Works, or Obedience, are meritorious causes of salvation.*

5 *That Children are not born in Sinn.*

6 *That the payment of Tithes to the Ministers of the Gospell is not agreeable to Scripture.*

Now

Now that these are false Tenents, not justifiable by Scripture, but repugnant unto it; I shall (I hope) make manifest to all that are not byassed with prejudice.

And because I am to enter the Lists and contest with pertinacious Adversaries, who sometime will neither hear right Reason, nor yeild to Scripture, but as they themselves shall expound it: It will be expedient for me to premise certain Theologicall conclusions or principles (which all Orthodoxe Divines, unanimoully and univocally have acknowledged to be undoubted Truths) as *Præcognita*, and Canons to have recourse unto, for the decision and determination of any Controversie as need shall require; which if they deny to assent unto, they are not to be disputed with, as the proverb speaks, *Contra negantem principia non est disputandum.* There's no disputation to be held with him that will deny the principles of Art.

The Principles I think fit to premise are these foure:

1 *That the Canonicall Scripture is* αὐτόπιστος *that is authenticall and creditable of it self.*

2 *That there is no contradictions in the Canonicall Scripture.*

3 *That the same Scripture makes (and so by consequence alloweth to be made) distinction between things that sometime in Scripture have the same denomination.* This appears by many instances in Scripture, whereof I will name these three *Fear*, *Faith*, and *Sorrow*.

First about *Feare*, the Scripture mentioneth a Feare which is gratious and godly (which the learned have termed Filial) and a feare which is graceless (which the learned have termed Servile) of this we have an example in 2 *Kings* 17. 33. 34. where its said of the Babylonians in the former verse, *that they feared God*, and then in the latter verse, *that they feared him not*. Whence its evident that a distinction must be made of the feare of God, whereof some is a Gra-

tious

cious Feare, and some a Graceless, otherwise there would be a contradiction between the 2 verses, which Scripture admits not.

Secondly, about *Faith*, The Scripture doth distinguish it into these two sorts, namely a Faith that hath Works, and a Faith that is without works, which it also calleth a dead faith *James* 2. 17. *Faith if it have no Works, is dead being alone.*

Thirdly about *Sorrow*, The Scripture speaks of a godly sorrow for sinn, and a worldly sorrow, in 2. *Corinth.* 7. 10. *Godly sorrow worketh Repentance to salvation, but the sorrow of the World worketh death.* Hereby its clear that a distinction is sometimes to be made betwixt things that have the same denomination.

The fourth Principle, which I shall premise is this, *That seeming contradictions in Scripture are so to be expounded by help of other Texts (either speaking of the same point or otherwise) that they may symphonise and accord together.* Which help the Scripture affords in one place or other.

If our Adversaries will yield to be tried about the forementioned Controversies by these old Canons (which have been universally received for undoubted truths by all Christian Churches in primitive times, when the waters ran clearest from under the Threshold of the Sanctuary) I shall adventure to bear the disgrace, if I do not convince them of errour about each Controversie, that I have before named.

The first Controversie handled. About Election.

THeir first Errour that I shall undertake to confute is their assertion, *That Gods election of men unto salvation is grounded upon his foresight of their Faith and Obedience, or Sanctification and Good Works.* That is, that he electeth such and such men to life and salvation, because he

he foreſeeth that they will believe and walk in obedience to his Commandements.

This Aſſertion I ſhall prove to be an errour by theſe foure Arguments.

The firſt Argument. If men ſhall therefore believe, becauſe they are elected and ordained to eternall life, then they are not elected and ordained to eternall life becauſe they will believe. This conſequence cannot be denied by any intelligent man.

But men ſhall therefore believe, becauſe they are elected and ordained to eternall life, and therefore are not elected and ordained to it, becauſe they will believe.

The Aſſumption I prove out of *Acts* 13. 48. where its ſaid, *That as many as were ordained to eternall life believed.* Here Faith is made the fruit and effect of election to eternall life, and therefore cannot be the cauſe of it; for nothing can be the cauſe and effect too, of one and the ſame thing.

My ſecond Argument is this, If men be elected or choſen that they may be holy, then their election muſt needs be the ground and cauſe of their holineſs and ſanctification. But men are elected that they may be holy, ſo ſaith the Scripture *Epheſ.* 1.4. *He hath choſen us in him before the foundation of the World, that we ſhould be holy, and without blame before him in love.* Therefore Election is the ground and cauſe of holineſs or ſanctification, and not holineſs the ground and cauſe of election.

The third Argument, If the good pleaſure of Gods will be the ground and firſt cauſe of mens election and predeſtination to ſalvation, then Gods foreſight of their Sanctification and Good Works cannot be the firſt cauſe and ground thereof. This conſequence is undeniable.

But the good pleaſure of Gods will is the firſt cauſe and ground of mens election and predeſtination to ſalvation.

Therefore Gods foreſight of their ſanctification and

good-works cannot be the first cause and ground thereof.

The Assumption I prove from these two texts of Scripture (passing by many other to the same purpose) *Rom.* 9. 11. St. *Paul* there affirms, *That the purpose of God, according to Election, stands not of Works but of him that calleth.* Where works are denied and Gods will affirmed to be the cause of election. And *Ephes.* 1. 5. and again *verse* 11. the good pleasure of Gods will, is made the ground and cause of mens election to salvation. The words in the fift *verse* are these, *Having predestinated us to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ unto himself, according to the good pleasure of his will.* And the words in the 11 verse are these, *In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsell of his own will.*

If the Adversaries answer, that Election may be according to the good pleasure of Gods will, and yet the good pleasure of his will may not be the cause of Election.

To this I reply, that the Apostle makes it plain in the 11 verse, that he speaks of the good pleasure of Gods will, as the cause of Election, by the addition of these last words in the verse, *Who worketh all things after the counsell of his own will.* For if he worketh all things after the counsell of his own will, then Election is necessarily one of those things which he worketh after the counsell of his own will; and therefore the counsell of his own will must needs be the cause thereof.

The fourth Argument is this, If good Works be no causes of salvation, then neither of election unto salvation; this is plain, because Election is the cause of Salvation.

But good Works are no causes of salvation, and therefore no causes of Election.

The minor Proposition or Assumption is proved by *Ephes.* 2. 8. and 9. verses, where the Apostle saith, By

grace yee are ſaved through faith, and that not of your ſelves, it is the gift of God. Not of works, leſt any man ſhould boaſt.

And again *Tit.* 3. 5. *Not by works of righteouſneſs, which we have done, but according to his mercy he ſaved us by the waſhing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghoſt.*

The Adverſaries anſwer, that *theſe and ſuch like texts are ſpoken of works before regeneration.* To which I reply, that in *Tit.* 3. 5. the Apoſtle expreſly nominates works of righteouſneſs, and denies them to be any cauſes of ſalvation: but there be no works of righteouſneſs before regeneration; for then an evill tree ſhould bring forth good fruit, which our Saviour denies *Math.* 7. 18. And therefore even good works after regeneration are in Scripture denied to be any cauſes of ſalvation Hereof I ſhall have occaſion to ſpeake more largely hereafter; and therefore will not inſiſt any longer in the illuſtration of it.

Before I proceed to the next Controverſy, I will diſplay the weak argumentation of Mr. *Henry Haggar* before mentioned, for defence of election from foreſeen ſanctification; by his ſtraining Scripture from its proper ſenſe, and in not comparing it with other Scripture, where the genuine and proper ſenſe is clearly explained. He toiles himſelf to prove the ſaid point, becauſe its ſaid in 2. *Theſ.* 2. 13. That men are choſen to ſalvation through ſanctification of the Spirit. and therefore thence collects that they are not choſen before they are ſanctified by the Spirit, which is a very inconſequent collection: for it doth not follow, that becauſe men are choſen to ſalvation through ſanctification of the ſpirit, that therefore ſanctification of the Spirit is the cauſe of their election, or that therefore it precedes their election; but that therefore ſanctification is a *neceſſary* antecedent, way and meanes, through which they muſt be brought to ſalvation, whereto they were elected: as the way to any place is not the cauſe of a man his coming thither, but only

a neceſſary requiſite to be obſerved of him. And thus this text fitly agrees with other texts of Scripture, as that before mentioned *Epheſ.* 1. 4. where its ſaid, That *we are choſen, that we ſhould be holy.* which text he hath waved and never mentioned at all, but as Satan aledged the words of the Pſalmiſt, leaving out a part as knowing it would diſcloſe his wreſting and perverting the true ſenſe of the other text which he alledged. And ſo he neglects the premiſed rule of expounding Scripture by Scripture; which is of neceſſity to be obſerved to find out the true ſenſe and meaning of any text that is ambiguous, or may be variouſly expounded.

He alledgeth alſo the 1 *Pet.* 1. 2. where it is ſaid, *That men are elected according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through ſanctification of the Spirit*; Whence he collects, that God knows men firſt before he doth elect them.

To this I anſwer, firſt, that Gods preſcience or foreknowledge of men, and his election of them, are in him together, and one and the ſame act; for all his attributes are himſelf, and whatſoever is ſaid to be in hin is himſelf, as it hath ever been acknowledged by all learned divines. But in humane apprehenſion of them, his decrees precede his preſcience, for he doth not decree things to come, becauſe he foreſees them, but foreſees them becauſe he hath decreed them, as is colligible from St. *Paul*'s ſpeech before named *Epheſ.* 4 11. where he affirms that God worketh all things according to the Counſell of his own will; whence its manifeſt, that his own will is the firſt cauſe of all his workes, and not his preſcience, though his preſcience do concurre with his will.

Secondly, I anſwer, that the foreknowledge of God there mentioned is a foreknowledge with approbation: for the originall word, which is προγνωσις properly ſignifyes foreknowledgment, (as al men of learning know) which implies a concur-

concurrence of his election and approbation with his fore-knowledge of men; and not any precedence of his knowledge before his approbation and election of them.

And this affords an answer also to that place, which is brought by some of the adversaryes for defence of election from foreseen faith and holiness: in *Rom*: 8. 29. where its said, that *whom God did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Sonn*; where the greek verb, which is προγινωσκω signifies properly *fore acknowledged*; which intimates an election either with it or before the foreknowledge, and besides the words following lead to this sense, in that the Apostle expresseth that the predestination, which he mentioneth, as a sequell of Gods foreknowledge, is a predestination to be conformed to the image of his Son, that is, *to be holy as Christ is holy*. A Predestination to holiness cannot be a predestination for holiness, as was shewed before. He alledgeth but one text of Scripture more about this point (which is in the 4. page of his discourse, and which he abuseth very sufficiently as he doth the two former) and that is *Ephes*. 1. 11. and 12 verses; where the Apostle speaketh of himself and others, that they were predestinated, that they should be to the praise of Gods glory, who first trusted in Christ. Whence he ridiculously collecteth that they did first trust in Christ before they were predestinated. Whereas the priority or precedency of their Faith there mentioned by the Apostle, hath no relation at all to their predestination in Grammaticall construction; But to the faith of the Ephesians that were Greeks or Gentiles, and called to the faith of Christ after *Paul* and the other Apostles that were Jewes; as appears evidently by the next verse, where the Apostle adds, *In whom also ye trusted after that ye heard the word of truth*. As if he should have said, in whom we trusted first, and then ye afterwards, which agrees also with other Scripture as *Rom*. 1. 16. where

the Apostle saith that the Gospell is the power of God to salvation to every one that beleiveth, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.

The second Controversie. Of the Universallity of Christs Redemption.

TO decide and determine this controversy; I must first state the question aright between us and the Adversaryes.

To speake nothing of the word (*All*) which sometimes is put for *all sorts of men*, and sometimes for *all particular men of all sorts*. Seing we acknowledg that Christ dyed not onely for all sorts of men, but for all of all sorts, that do repent and believe.

The controversy depends upon these 3. Quæres, 1. *Whether Christ dyed for unbelievers at all or not.*

2. *Whether he dyed for them in as full and ample sense as for believers.*

3. *In what sense he dyed for them, and in what sense he dyed not for them.*

To the first Quære or question, I answer affirmatively (for my part) that Christ dyed for unbelievers in some sense.

To the 2. I answer negatively; *scil.* that he dyed not for unbelievers in as full and ample sense as for believers. which I prove from Scripture 3. waies. 1. Because its said sometime in Scripture that he dyed for many as well as for all; as *Esa.* 53. 12. *He bare the sins of many. Matth.* 20. 28. *He gave his life a ransome for many. Hebr.* 9. 28. *Christ was once offered to beare the sins of many.* Which expressions import, that he dyed not for all alike; but for many in one sense and for all in another; or els the expression of his dying for many were needlesse; in that it is so oft expressed that he dyed for all. Secondly, because its oft

said

ſaid that he dyed for his Church; as *Joh.* 10. 15. *I lay down my life for the ſheepe.* *Epheſ.* 5. 25. *Husbands love your Wives even as Chriſt alſo loved the Church, and gave himſelf for it.* Which imports alſo that he dyed for all men in one ſenſe, and for his Church in another.

Thirdly becauſe the Scripture hath (*in terminis*) in expreſs words put a difference between his being a Saviour to all men, and his being a Saviour to them that believe, as in 1. *Timoth.* 4. 10. *We truſt in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, ſpecially of thoſe that believe.* From whence I argue thus. Chriſt dyed for all men, but he is a Saviour of all men in a different ſenſe and ſort; namely generally of the univerſality of men, and ſpecially of his Church; (witneſs the diſtinction made by the Apoſtle in the fore-cited text) Therefore he dyed for all men in a different ſenſe and ſort, namely in one ſenſe and ſort for the univerſality of men, and in another ſenſe and ſort for the particularity of his Church.

To the 3. Quære I anſwer; that he dyed for all wicked men and unbelievers in theſe two ſenſes according to Scripture. 1. As ſuffering a ſatisfactory puniſhment for the ſins of all the men in the world, ſo as they are not left deſtitute of the meanes of remiſſion of ſins and of ſalvation; according to the words of the Apoſtle 1. *Tim.* 2. 6. *There is one Mediator between God and men, the man Chriſt Jeſus; who gave himſelf a ranſome for all,* a teſtimony in due time. And againe *Heb.* 2. 9. the Apoſtle ſaith that *he taſted death for every man.* 2. He dyed for them upon condition of their faith and obedience according to theſe Scriptures, *Joh.* 3. 16. *God ſo loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whoſoever believeth in him ſhould not periſh, but have everlaſting life.* And *Heb.* 5. 9 *He became the author of eternall ſalvation unto all them that obey him.* And ſo in like manner its the affirmation of ſundry other texts of Scripture.

But then he dyed not for them with an intention and pur-

poſe to give them grace to repent and believe, and ſo to bring them to ſalvation, which appeares by Scripture to be a cleare truth these 2 waies. 1. Becauſe Scripture hath revealed abundantly Gods purpoſe to the contrary, namely to ſave ſome men but not all; The proofs whereof are ſo numerous, that I need not quote any. 2. Becauſe if Chriſt dyed for all men with an intention and purpoſe to ſave all, then either all ſhall be ſaved (which is contradicted by a hundred places of Scripture) or els Chriſts purpoſe may be altered: But his purpoſe cannot be altered or diſapointed, and therefore he dyed not for all with a purpoſe to ſave all. That his purpoſe cannot be altered I prove; both becauſe he can neither alter it himſelf, nor can any other alter it. That he cannot alter it himſelf is oft taught in Scripture *Mal. 3. 6. I am the Lord, I change not. Jam. 1. 17. With him is no variableneſs, neither ſhadow of turning.* Neither can any other alter it; for his purpoſe is immutable, and his will irreſiſtible *Eſa. 46. 10. My counſell ſhall ſtand, and I will do all my pleaſure*, and *43. 13. I will work, and who ſhall let it?* and *Rom. 9. 19. Who hath reſiſted his will?*

Thus then from the premiſſes already ſufficiently proved, I conclude and determine the controverſy thus. That Chriſt dyed for all the men in the World in theſe two ſenſes. Firſt as paying by his death a ſufficient ranſome for the ſins of them all; which the Scripture calls λυτρον a price of redemption ſeverall times. Secondly that he dyed for them all upon condition of their faith and obedience; but dyed not for all men with purpoſe to bring all actually to ſalvation. And ſo the old diſtinction of Chriſts dying for all men, either *ſufficienter* or *efficaciter*, ſufficiently or effectually (as it may be underſtood, and applyed,) ſtands ſtill upon its *baſis* and feet; and challengeth all the deſertors and rejecters of it to frame a more ſimple and proper diſtinction between Chriſts dying for all men, and his dying

for his Church. Seeing a distinction between them is to be made (as hath been already declared) by testimony of Scripture.

The 3. Controversy, which is of all other the most difficult and knotty.

WHether an unregenerate man hath power to repent and believe, and so be saved, if he will.

Mr. *Haggar* answers hereto in the affirmative, in page the 25. of his fore-mentioned discourse. I answer to it in the negative; denying that a naturall man hath power to repent and believe by the energy or strength of his own free will, but needs the help of the speciall preventing grace of God, ere he can be converted, *or he cannot convert himself.*

For the fuller opening and enodation of this controversy; and because therein I have more learned adversaries to deal with, than Anabaptists, I will first speak out what the will of an unregenerate man is able to do towards his conversion, without the help of Gods speciall efficacious grace, or preventing grace (as the learned call it.)

And then, Secondly, how far it cooperates with Gods grace in his conversion.

About the first, notice is to be taken of a threefold liberty of Wil; namely, *The liberty of Nature, the liberty of Grace*, and *the liberty of Glory*; Of which, though these two last were lost by *Adams* fall, yet the first was not lost, but remains still; so as by virtue thereof the Will hath liberty to will or nill without compulsion or constraint, and that not only in naturall and civill actions, but also in morall and ecclesiasticall. In morall actions to practise virtue as Justice, Temperance, Liberality, *&c.* and so to do some things commanded in Gods Law; as both experience shews, and *Paul* testifies *Rom.* 2. 14. where he saith, *that the Gentiles did by*

 nature

nature the things contained in the Law. In Eccleſiaſticall actions an unregenerate man hath liberty alſo, namely to perform the duties of Gods worſhip and ſervice for the outward act; as to come to Church, hear and read the word of God, pray, partake of the Sacraments, do works of charity, and conferre about religion and the doctrine of faith; as common experience ſhews, all which are good preparatives to, and oft times efficacious means of regeneration and converſion. Yet muſt this liberty of will about all theſe actions either of doing them or leaving them undone be underſtood with this caution; ſo far forth as God ſhall be pleaſed to afford both the concurrence of his generall and divine providence, (which enableth all creatures to motion and action) and the concurrence of his common reſtraining grace, which in ſome meaſure, more or leſs, he affordeth promiſcuouſly to all ſorts of men, both regenerate and unregenerate.

Thus far an unregenerate man is able to move and bend himſelf toward the work of his converſion by the natural liberty of his will.

About the ſecond, namely *how far forth mans will cooperates with God in his converſion.* I will firſt rehearſe the Adverſaries aſſertion, (amongſt which the Papiſts are chief, and leaders to the reſt) and then the aſſertion of the Reformed Churches. The Papiſts ſay, That the will of man before regeneration can by the help of the exciting grace of God (though not without it as *Pelagius* ſaid) will its own converſion; and either accept or reject Gods grace of internall vocation; and ſo cooperates with the grace of God in the firſt act of of converſion. So teacheth the Councell of *Trent*, and *Bellarmine* in his booke, *de gratia & libero Arbitr. lib. 6. cap. 15.*

This opinion the Reformed Churches diſrelish and reject as diſſenting from Holy Scripture, and aſſert the contrary thus.

That

That the will of man is a meer patient, and not agent at all in the first act of conversion; and Gods grace is the sole efficient cause thereof; and the will but *subjectum recipiens*, the subject receiving the grace of conversion. But in all other good acts following the first, mans will so renewed cooperates with the grace of God. And this was the learned St. *Augustine* his assertion, as its expressed (in the 17. chap. of his booke, *de gratia & libero arbit.*) in these words *Ut velimus, Deus sine nobis operatur; quum autem volumus, & sic volumus ut faciamus, nobiscum cooperatur.* To will, God works without us; but when we do will, and so will that we act, God co-works with us.

That this latter assertion is the truth, I shall make it appear by these three Arguments.

The first Argument.

As is a dead man to his Revivification or Restauration to life, so is a natural man to his Regeneration or Conversion; which is his Restauration to spiritual life.

But a dead man can be no cause of his own Revivification or Restauration to life.

And therefore a naturall man can be no cause of his Regeneration, or Restauration to spirituall life.

The assumption no man that hath reason can deny; for there is an impossibility that a dead man should cooperate to his own Revivification. The Major, or first Proposition is justifyed by those many Texts of Scripture, where its affirmed of men unregenerate, that they are dead in sinn, as *Luke 9. 60. Let the dead bury their dead, id est*, The dead in sin, their bodily dead. And *Luke 15. 24. This my Son was dead, id est* in sinn. And *Ephes. 2 1. You hath he quickened who were dead in Treſpaſſes and Sinns.* And *Col. 2. 13. And you being dead in your ſinns and the uncircumciſion of your fleſh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all Treſpaſſes,*

An

And this very argument (though not in the ſame words, yet to the ſame purpoſe and effect *Bellarmine* uſeth againſt the Pelagians in his *Lib. 6. & cap. 5. De gratia & Libero Arb.* adding onely this cauſe to the Aſſumption; *That a dead man neither doth nor can diſpoſe himſelf to life, unleſs he receive ſome vitall power from him that revives him*; which (it appears) he therefore added; leſt the argument ſhould reflect, and ſo be retorted upon himſelf: who afterwards, in the 10. chapter of the ſame book, attributes power to mans will to work with God in his firſt converſion; the will being but firſt aided and excited by the preventing grace of God; by which he means (as its there very evident) a grace preceding the work of converſion. But that the argument, which he there uſeth againſt *Pelagius*, doth confute himſelf; in that the clauſe, which he hath added to the Aſſumption, doth not turn away the edge of the argument from himſelf, I make it plain thus. A dead man can receive no vitall power from him that revives him, till he have firſt received ſoul and life, becauſe there can be no vitall power but in a living ſubject; it being a proper adjunct of a living ſubject *quarto modo*. If then he muſt receive ſoul and life before he can have any vitall power, then cannot his vitall power cooperate to his revivification, but muſt of neceſſity be a conſequent and an effect of his enlivening. And ſo in like manner the caſe is the ſame with a man ſpiritually dead. He muſt firſt be revived by God before he can have any vitall power in him to work with the grace of God; and therefore can be no cauſe at all of his revivification and converſion, in reſpect of the firſt act thereof.

The Second Argument.

IF all the powers of mans ſoul be ſo depraved, that even the chiefeſt of them, namely his Wiſdome (a power conſiſting

ſiſting both in the underſtanding and will be oppoſite to the Will of God, and the Law of God; and ſo oppoſite that it cannot be made conformable and ſubject to the Law of God, while it is the wiſdome of the fleſh, that is, till it be renewed and changed from fleſhly wiſdome to ſpirituall wiſdome; then can there be no power in mans will whereby to cowork with God in the firſt act of his converſion.

But all the power and faculties of mans ſoul are depraved *&c.*

Therefore there can be no power in mans Will to cowork with God in the firſt act of his Converſion.

The conſequence in the firſt Propoſition is clear to any intelligent perſon, for if the wiſdome of the fleſh (which leads and guides the Will) cannot conform and be ſubject to the Law of God, while it is the wiſdome of the fleſh; then cannot the will, which is guided by it, cooperate with the will of God while it is the will of the fleſh; and therefore by undeniable conſequence muſt be renewed before it can cooperate with his will.

And the Aſſumption is the expreſs affirmation of Scripture *Gen. 6. 5. Every imagination of the thoughts of mans heart is onely evill continually*, and *Rom. 8, 7. The wiſdome of the fleſh is enmity againſt God; for it is not ſubject unto the Law of God, neither indeed can be*

The Third Argument.

MY 3. Argument ſhall be the quotation of thoſe many texts of Scripture, where the cooperation of mans Will with Gods Grace in the firſt work of regeneration is clearly excluded; and the work attributed to God alone. For brevities ſake I will quote but ſome of the cleareſt and moſt convincing proofs; and omit the reſt, which are very numerous.

Joh. 1: 13. The Spirit of God ſpeaking there of regenerate perſons, affirmeth that they are born not of blood, nor

of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. In which words the Spirit of God expressing a perfect distribution of all the powers and forces, that are or can be in man, excludes them all from this work, and ascribes it to the alone will of God; for it neither proceedeth from the blood of man; that is from any prerogative of naturall propagation or generation, which was wont to bee the Pharisees vain bragg and ostentation, *We are Abrahams seed*, For which they were sharply reproved by *John Baptist Math.* 3. 9. Nor doth it proceed from the will of the flesh; that is, from the naturall strength of mans corrupt will; nor yet from the will of man; that is, of such a man, whose corrupt will is corrected, bettered, and amended, either by the help of the common grace of God, or by the acquisition of humane learning, or by his own wise observation and experience; (for this force the Greek word ἀνὴρ carrieth with it, which is here used, and so in like manner doth the Latin word *vir*, by which its also translated in the Latin) from none of these forces in man doth this work proceed (and these are all the forces in mans will) but they are all excluded, and God alone is made the Author and Procreant cause thereof.

A second testimony that I shall produce for proof of this Truth is in *Ephes.* 2. 8, 9, and 10. verses, where the Apostle speaks thus to the *Ephesians*. *By grace ye are saved, through faith and that not of your selves; it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast; for we are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.* In which words the Apostle strives to annihilate our selves about this work, and to take away all pretences of our cooperation with God therein. For first he saith, its not of our selves; and then he saith, its not of works, lest any man should boast; but there were matter of boasting, if our selves were coworkers with

with God herein. And then he addeth (to remove all scruple about it) *that we are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus unto good works.* Where note, that he doth not say, his workmanship renewed or repaired (though that be true) but his workmanship created. The Apostle (as it may seem) did pick out this word on purpose (which he again also useth speaking of this work in the 4 chap. following, and 24. v. his words are, *Put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holyness*) that he might altogether exclude all cooperation herein with God on our part: for to create is the proper act of God; and no creature can have any hand therein.

There be many other pregnant and punctuall proofs of Scripture for this point. *As Ezek.* 36. 26. *A new heart will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you, and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh.* If God make all new, and take away all the old, then is there none of the old left to help to make it self new.

Philip. 2. 13 *It's God that worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure.* therefore the Will works not, till God first work upon it.

2. *Corinth.* 3. 5. *We are not sufficient of our selves to think any thing as of our selves, but our sufficiency is of God.* If we be not sufficient of our selves to think that which is good, then not to will it; for, *Velum as sequitur intellectum*; the Will follows the Thought.

Jam. 1. 18. *Of his own will begat he us by the word of truth.* If of his own will, then not by help of our will.

But to avoid prolixity and tediousness (which I ever disliked) I will rest satisfied with the quotation of those few proofes of Scripture which I have already cited, pretermitting a number more of like sort; as hoping they may satisfy the unprejudiced Reader, because they are so clear and convincing.

I have not yet done with this Controverſie, but have ſomething more to ſay about it. And that is, to invalidate the main Argument or objection which is brought by them of the Adverſary part againſt this truth, (for I read of no other of any force) whis is this.

Its ſaid by them. *That men are called upon in Scripture to turn to God, very often, which if they have not power of themſelves to do, the commandment is either unjuſt or needleſs for* Nemo tenetur ad impoſſibile.

To this I return a fivefold ſolution or anſwer.

First, That though we have no power ſo to do now, as we are fallen in *Adam*, yet did God give us ſo much grace in our firſt creation, as would have impowred us herunto, if we our ſelves had not loſt it. And therefore is it no ſeverity or injuſtice, for God to require that at our hands, which he once gave us power to do, though now we cannot do it, becauſe we our ſelves have made our ſelves unable to do it, and not God.

And here I deſire the Reader to take notice, how unfit a compariſon one of our Adverſaries (in this point) hath uſed; (though cryed up for a man of learning) who chargeth God with as great ſeverity, bidding us to turn unto him, if we have not of our ſelves now freedome of will ſo to do, as for a man to cut of another mans legs, and then bid him run, but by his leave (for all his great learning) the caſe is not alike, but varies and fails in the main point of all: which is this. In that God gave man legs to run the way of his commandments before he bad him run; which he hath cut of himſelf. God gave man power to do all that he requires at his hand, and man hath bereaved himſelf thereof. And therefore its neither injuſtice nor ſeverity in God to require of man what he once gave him power to do, though now he be unable, becauſe he hath diſabled himſelf. If God had made man unable, the compariſon might have held, but

ſeing man made himſelf unable, the compariſon halteth.

Secondly I anſwer, that Gods commandments do not alway import, what we can doe, but what we ſhould; they do not alwaies argue our ability, but our duty. As for example (to inſtance but in one particular of many) *We are commanded to love God with all the heart, and with all the ſoul, and our neighbour as our ſelves*: This we cannot do in that fulneſs that the Law requires, yet is it not severity in God to require it of us, becauſe he once impowred us unto it, namely in our firſt creation. And the caſe is the ſame about our converſion.

Thirdly I anſwer, that God requires it, though we cannot of our ſelves do it, that we may be put in mind to crave his aid, who onely is able to make us to do it. This reaſon is given by St. *Auguſtin* in theſe words *Jubet Deus quæ non poſſumus; ut noverimus quæ ab illo petere debemus.* God commands us what we cannot do, to intimate unto us what we ought to crave of him; namely, what we cannot do of our ſelves. And hence are thoſe many prayers of ſeveral ſorts of perſons in the Scripture, as *Pſalm* 51. 10. *Create in me a clean heart, O Lord, and renew a right ſpirit within me.* And *Jerm.* 31. 18. *Convert thou me and I ſhall be converted.* And *Lament.* 5. 21. *Turn thou us unto thee, O Lord, and we ſhalbe turned.*

Fourthly, I anſwer, that God commands us this, though we cannot do it of our ſelves; that we may be excited to uſe ſuch means as are by Gods ordinances and appointment conducible and available thereunto; and which we have of our ſelves power to uſe, which are Prayer, the Word and the Sacraments: for his calling to us to repent and return unto him, is a provocation or calling to us, to uſe ſuch means, as he hath appointed to produce the ſame in us.

Fiftly and laſtly I anſwer, That ſuch commands aim not onely at our firſt converſion but at our ſecondary and ſub-

ſequent returns to God; when, after our firſt converſion, we prevaricate and digreſs from him: in which ſecondary returns mans will cooperates with the grace of God, as formerly hath been ſaid. And therefore Gods invitation of men to theſe returns, wherein their wils have ſome ability to cooperate with his grace, is not vain or needleſs, but very efficacious to allure and induce them thereunto.

Not to tire the Reader with any further diſpute about this controverſy, I will cloſe it up with the addition of theſe two reaſons to the former Arguments, to induce all perſons to adhere to this opinion as the ſafeſt, which I have here aſſerted. Firſt, becauſe this opinion makes a clearer reconciliation of thoſe Texts of Scripture which hold forth a ſeeming contradiction about this point, than the other doth; for according to the other opinion, they are not reconciled without ſome ſcruple. Secondly, becauſe this opinion aſcribes moſt glory to God, to whom all glory belongs; wherein there is no danger, though men detract from themſelves. For to detract from nature, and give to grace, is no danger; but to detract from grace, and give to nature, cannot but be dangerous. This was the ſaying of *Peter Lumbard*, and is of all acknowledged and owned for truth.

The Fourth Controverſy. About the merit of good works.

THe Papiſts opinion about this, and Mr. *Hagger's* in affirming good works to be cauſes of ſalvation (which both they do, and he alſo in the 9. page of his forenamed diſcourſe) hath ſo little appearance of truth, that it deſerves to be exploded, rather than refuted. And I have good ground for what I affirm. Firſt, becauſe its ſo apparently repugnant to Scripture; as to *Epheſ.* 2. 8. 9. where its ſaid *By grace ye are ſaved, through faith, and that not of your ſelves, it is the gift of God: not of works leſt any ſhould boaſt.* And *Tit.* 3. 5. *Not by the works of righteouſneſs, which we have done, but according to his mercy he ſaved us.*

And

And whereas, to salve up the discord between *Paul's* affirmation and theirs, they make a distinction of good works; of which some (say they) go before justification, and some follow after it: and St. *Paul* (they say) speaks of those that go before; but they speak of such as follow after; and therefore they do not contradict him; I have formerly declared (namely in my 4th. *Argument*: about the first controversy, in page the 11) that the Apostle speaks of the same good works which they speak of; namely, of good works after justification and regeneration. And therefore they are herein contradictors of holy Scripture.

Another ground for what I affirmed before, is this; because I never had conference with any Papist yet (and I have conferred with many in my time) but they all disclaimed the merit of their own works, when upon occasion of discourse I have charged them with this grosse Tenet.

I have yet a third ground for what I said; and that is, because I find *Bellarmine* their Arch-champion, after his affirmation of the merit of good works, and that they are true causes of salvation, and that some confidence may be placed in them (in his book of Controversies, namely *Libr. 5. cap. 7. de Justificat.*) to give men counsell, within ten lines after, *to put no confidence in their merits, but in the alone mercy and benignity of God, as the safest way.* So that there is no great necessity to confute this opinion of the merit of works, seing themselves do distrust it, and after a sort desert it.

But yet some short confutation of this palpable error I will deliver; which (I hope) shall sufficiently convince it. And the first Argument I frame thus.

Argument 1.

IF eternall life or salvation be Gods gift, then is it not merited by mans good works: so the Apostle argues *Rom. 11. 6. If it be of grace, it is no more of works.* But eternall life is Gods gift; for saith our Saviour *Luk. 12. 32. Fear not little flock*

flock, for it is your fathers pleasure to give you a Kingdome; where note, that its said to be a gift, and from no other motive, but from his own good pleasure. and *John.* 10. 28. *My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow; and I give unto them eternall life.* and saith St. *Paul Rom.* 6. 23. *The gift of God is eternall life through Jesus Christ our Lord.* Therefore eternall life is not merited by mans good works.

Argument. 2.

IF all the good works which possibly we can do, be due debt to Almighty God, then can they not merit Heaven at his hand; for merit and debt cannot stand together; a man cannot be said to merit by paying that which he oweth.

But they are due debts: so our Saviour teacheth *Luk.* 17. 10. *when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, we are unprofitable servants; we have done that which was our duty to do.* Therefore they cannot merit.

Agument 3.

IF our good works be not properly our own, but proceed from the grace of God, which worketh them in us and by us, then can they not be said to merit from God, though they may merit from others: because we return no more to God, than what we have received from him; we give him but a cluster of grapes out of his own Vineyard, and water out of his ovvn Fountain (If any man discern not the necessity of this consequent, its for vvant of perspicacity in his own understanding and not for want of truth in the consequence; And *Bellarmine* doth acknowledg it *in Libr.* 5. *cap.* 15. *De Grat. & Lib. Arb.* good vvorks are not properly our ovvn, but proceed from the grace of God, vvhich vvorketh the same in us and by us; so its said *Esa.* 26. 12. *Lord, thou wilt ordain peace for us: for thou also hast wrought all our works in us.* and *Phil.* 2. 13. *Its God that gives to will*

and

and to work of his good pleasure. Therefore the conclusion is true.

Argument 4.

IF our good works be not every way responsible and suitable to the Law of God, which requires them at our hands; then can they not be meritorious; this is clear. But they are not so. Therefore they cannot merit.

That they are not answerable and agreeable to Gods Law is most evident; because they are imperfect and defective: whereas the Law of God is perfect, as *David* affirms *Psal.* 19. 7. Now that they are imperfect and defective, its divers times affirmed in Scripture: *Esa.* 64. 6. *All our righteousnesses are as filthy rags. Rom.* 7. 18. *To will is present with me, but how to perform that which is good, I find not.* And again in the 21. verse, *When I would do good, evill is present with me.*

Argument 5.

IF there be no analogy and proportion between eternall life and our good works, then cannot our good works merit eternall life. This consequence is a clear truth in reason: for a reward is to be adequated and proportioned unto the work.

But there is no analogy and proportion between eternall life and good works; for the reward of eternall life is infinite; but mans good works are finite; and (*finiti ad infinitum nulla est proportio*) between a finite thing and an infinite there is no proportion. Therefore the Conclusion holds, That eternall life cannot be merited by mens good works.

I will answer the main Argument for the merit of works; and so I will conclude concerning this Controversy.

Its aledged for defence of the merit of works, That the Scripture affirms that they shall be rewarded with eternall life, and that very often, as *Math.* 5. 12, *Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you and persecute you &c. Rejoyce and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in Heaven Luk.* 14. 14. *When thou makest a feast, call the poore &c. and thou shalt be*

recompenſed at the reſurrection of the juſt. Heb. 11. 26. *He ſaid, that Moſes eſteemed the rebuke of Chriſt greater riches than the treaſures of Egypt, becauſe he had reſpect unto the recompence of reward.* And oft elſwhere eternall life is called a reward, which (ſay the Adverſaries) imports the merit of good works becauſe (*merces & meritum.*) reward and merit are relatives.

To this I anſwer, That there is a double reward: 1. A reward of merit or debt, and 2. A reward of mercy or favour. And this diſtinction is not deviſed and coyned by mans wit, nor hewed out of the quarry of his brain, but is framed by the Holy Ghoſt himſelf, *Rom.* 4. 4. where its thus written, *Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt*; where he hath made an apparent diſtribution of reward into theſe two ſorts: 1. A reward of grace: and 2. A reward of debt. Now eternall life is a reward of grace, mercy or favour; and not a reward of debt or merit as the texts before quoted demonſtrate, *ſcil. Luk.* 12. 32. *Joh.* 10. 28. *and Rom.* 6. 23. In all which places its called *the gift of God*; and a gift proceeding from his own pleaſure: and therefore can be no debt that God oweth to men for their good workes; for a gift and debt, are ſo diſſentaneous, that they cannot conſiſt together, nor be predicated of one and the ſame ſubject.

And hence it is, that though God hath oft promiſed to reward ſuch as do good works with everlaſting life, (that he may provoke all men unto them) yet it is no where ſaid, that they ſhall be rewarded for them (for that might have been interpreted, to have intimated and imported ſome merit in them) but the Scripture in mentioning Gods reward of good works, uſeth this phraſe; That *they ſhall be rewarded according to their works*, which intimates the reward to be given of Gods mercy, and not to be obtained by mans merits. Thus its expreſſed *Pſal.* 62. 12. *Unto*

to thee, O Lord, belongeth mercy; for thou renderest to every man according to his work. Matth. 16. 27. *The ſon of man ſhall come in the glory of the Father with his Angels; and then he ſhall reward every man according to his works. 2. Cor.* 5. 10. *We muſt all appear before the tribunall ſeat of Chriſt, that every man may receive according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad. Revel.* 20. 12, *and* 13. *verſes.* Its twiſe ſaid of the dead, that they were judged according to their works, and in chapter the 22. and verſe the 12. *Behold* (ſaith Chriſt) *I come quickly, and my reward is with me to give to every man according as his work ſhall be.*

This is the conſtant expreſſion of Scripture in ſpeaking of the reward of good works, to phraſe it (according to works) and no where (for them) leſt men ſhould preſume to aſcribe ſome merit unto them.

And this makes it evident, that the Popiſh diſtinction of the merit of condignity, and the merit of congruity, is but a meer gingle and ſhift to evade the force of the former arguments againſt the merit of good works; for the merit of congruity (which they attribute to good works) proceeds from mercy (as they confeſs themſelves) and therefore cannot properly be called merit; for mercy and merit are contradiſtinct and inconſiſtent, its the very affirmation of Scripture, *Rom.* 11. 6. *If by grace, then its no more of works, otherwiſe grace is no more grace: but if it be of works, then is it no more grace; otherwiſe work is no more work.* Here the Apoſtle makes a flat oppoſition between grace and works; and there is the very ſame oppoſition between mercy and merit, which hath forced that confeſſion from *Bellarmine*, (which hath oft dropped from his pen in his book of Controverſies) *Merita noſtra ſunt Dei munera.* The like was St. *Bernard* his confeſſion to Almighty God; *Meritum meum eſt miſericordia tua, my merit is thy mercy.* Both which are agreeable to the ſentence of St. *Auguſtine*

in his book of Homilies, (in Homil. the 14.) *Quam bona opera nostra remunerat Deus, non merita nostra, sed sua dona coronat. When God rewardeth our good works, he crowns his own gifts, and not our merits.*

From this premiſed diſcourſe I deduct this corollary or capitulation of the cauſes of ſalvation, as they are in order manifeſted in Scripture.

Firſt, Gods free grace and love is the primary and principall efficient cauſe of election unto ſalvation. This is juſtified by theſe texts (beſide many other) *Rom.* 11. 5. *Even ſo then at this preſent time alſo, there is a remnant according to the election of grace.*

Epheſ. 1. 5. *Having predeſtinated us to the adoption of children by Jeſus Chriſt to himſelf, according to the good pleaſure of his will.* And again, in the 11. verſe following of the ſame chapter. *In whom alſo we have obtained an inheritance, being predeſtinated according to the purpoſe of him, who worketh all things after the counſell of his own will.*

Secondly, Chriſts obedience, active and paſſive, is the meritorious cauſe of ſalvation, and of all the means conducting thereunto. So *Coloſ.* 1. 14. *we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveneſs of ſins.* and 1. *Joh.* 1. 7. *The blood of Jeſus Chriſt his ſon cleanſeth us from all ſin.* and 1. *Pet.* 1. 18, 19. *Knowing that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as ſilver and gold, from your vain converſation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Chriſt, as of a lamb without blemiſh and without ſpot;* with many ſuch like texts.

Thirdly, Faith is the inſtrumentall cauſe, that is to ſay, the inſtrument whereby we receive Chriſt and onely his merits to us; ſo *Joh.* 1. 12. *As many as received him, to them he gave power to become the ſons of God, even to them that believe on his name.* And *Epheſ.* 3. 17. The Apoſtle ſaith, that *Chriſt dwells in our hearts by faith.* And hence it is our

righte-

righteouſneſs is called, both *the righteouſneſs of faith Rom.* 10.6. and *the righteouſneſs, which is by faith, Hebr.* 11. 7. and *the righteouſneſs, which is of God by faith, Philip.* 3. 9.

Fourthly and laſtly, vocation, and juſtification, and ſanctification, and good works, and eternall life and ſalvation, are the joynt fruits and effects of the aforenamed cauſes, ſucceſſively following one another. Vocation, Juſtification, and Sanctification, & good works, are the firſt fruits & effects of the foreſaid cauſes brought forth here in this life, as numerous Texts of Scripture teſtifie, which I need not recite, becauſe they are familiarly known, & becauſe I have mentioned divers of them formerly. And Eternal Life and Salvation is the laſt fruit, the conſummation and ultimate end of all, as its very often taught & teſtified. *Rom.* 6. 22. *Being made free from ſin, and become ſervants to God, ye have your fruit unto holineſs, and the end everlaſting life.* and 1. *Pet.* 1. 9. *Receiving the end of your faith, even the ſalvation of your ſouls.*

Theſe are the links of the golden chain of ſalvation, and the order of the cauſes thereof; as they are annexed and held forth to us in the word of God. And in *Rom.* 8. 30. they are ſummed up together, though in fewer words. *Whom he did predeſtinate,* (ſaith the Apoſtle) *them he alſo called; and whom he called, them he alſo juſtified, and whom he juſtified them he alſo glorified.*

And hence is Mr. *Haggars* groſs errour, in his concatenation of the cauſes of ſalvation, detected and confuted; In that he makes ſanctification and good works cauſes of ſalvation; which are but fruits and effects of Gods election, and the merits of Chriſt apprehended by faith, for they go before ſalvation onely as neceſſary antecedents, and as the appointed way to lead us to ſalvation, and as preparatives for Heaven; (as hath been already declared) but not as cauſes thereof. 1. They are, *Via regni*, but not, *cauſa regnandi*. So that as the way to any place, is not the cauſe that

brings any man to it, though he muſt needs paſs through the way, to come to that place; but the cauſe of his comming to it, is his his own will and motion. So ſanctification and good works, though they be neceſſary antecedents to ſalvation, ſo that we cannot paſs to Heaven, but through them: yet they are not the cauſes, which brings us thither; but the cauſes thereof are the mercyes of God and the merits of Chriſt apprehended by Faith. And ſo I end this Controverſy.

If now I have not untyed the Gordian knots of theſe long debated Controverſies, ſo fully & openly, as to give ſatisfaction to all whoſe thoughts have been formerly puzzled (as I believe I ſhall not) yet my labour will not be wholly loſt in theſe regards; Firſt, becauſe I have hereby declared my willingneſs to do the Church ſervice to my power, by putting my hand to the ſupportation of the truth of the goſpell, which theſe ſtormy times have ſo impetuouſly and vehemently ſhaken. Secondly, becauſe what I have delivered may happily give ſatiſfaction to ſome, and let them looſe out of the briers of their heſitation, that were doubtfull before, what opinion to incline to. Thirdly, becauſe this my Eſſay may happily be an occaſion to invite and induce ſome more Logicall and Learned pen to publiſh a more Scholaſtick and plenary ſolution of them.

The 5. Controverſy. About Originall Sin.

THat I may the more fully diſcover and confute this errour, I will unfold theſe 4. points about the ſin of our natures, the ſin wherein we are conceived and born: which therefore all Orthodox Divines have fitly and properly called originall ſin.

Firſt I will render a reaſon of the epithete, why it is called originall ſin.

Secondly, I will give a definition of the ſin what it is.

Thirdly, I will alleadg ſome of the evident proofs of Scripture

ture for the justification of it.

Fourthly, I will frame some irrefragable and convincing arguments drawn out of Scripture to prove it, by necessary and undeniable consequence.

The First Point opened.

THe sinfull corruption or corrupt disposition of mans nature from the womb, hath many epithetes or names given unto it in Scripture, which denote and declare that it hath its originall and beginning with mans conception and birth; and therefore is fitly and properly termed, originall sin, and so ever hath been for above this thousand years, by all sound and Learned Divines both ancient and modern. For though it be not *in terminis*, in these very words so called in Scripture; yet hath it divers other epithetes & names there given it; which are consignificant, and import and imply the same sense and meaning, with these words originall sin, amongst which take notice of these.

Rom. 6. 6. Its called, *The old man, and the body of sin.*

1. Corinth. 5. 7. Its termed, *The old leaven.*

Rom. 7. 17. The sin that dwelleth in us.

Rom. 7. 23. The Law in our members.

Rom. 7. 24. The body of death.

Galat. 5. 16. The lusts of the flesh.

Iam. 1. 14. A mans own lust, in which text in the next words following, it is punctually distinguished from all actuall sins; as being expresly affirmed to be the procreant cause of all actuall sin: for the cause and the effects cannot be one and the same.

The Second Point opened; what originall sin is.

ORiginall sin is a pravity, vitiosity, or vitious habit, or corrupt disposition of mans nature from his first conception; as a just punishment of all mens sin in *Adam*; whereby they are born the children of wrath, and become subject to death both of body and soul; and also become

prone

prone to commit all actuall sins.

Or thus.

Originall sin is a pravity of mans nature from his first conception; whereby he seems to be prone to all sin; as a just punishment of *Adams* sin or transgression, whereof all men are guilty; and for which all men are exposed and subjected to death both corporall and eternall.

Both these definitions have one and the same sense. And from them ye may observe that there be three things in originall sin, or three parts of it. The first is the guilt of *Adams* sin, whereof St. *Paul* speaks *Rom.* 5. 19. where he saith, *By one mans disobedience many were made sinners.*

Secondly there is the defect and want of originall righteousnes; whereof he speaks *Rom.* 3. 23. *All have sinned and come short of the glory of God, i. e.* of Gods image, which was in mans first creation stamped upon him. And for this exposition I have warrant from 1. *Cor.* 11. 7. in that the Apostle there joyned these together as synonimas, image and glory, when he saith, *That man is the image and glory of God.*

Thirdly there is the succession of a vitious habit and corrupt disposition in mans nature in place of his primitive righteousnes; whereof we read *Genes.* 6. 5. where God himself witnesseth, *That the whole imagination of the thoughts of mans heart was onely evill continually.* and *Psal.* 14. 2. and 3. *vers. David* saith, *That the Lord looked down from Heaven upon the children of men; to see if there were any that did understand and seeke God. They are all gone aside, they are altogether become filthy.*

And here I desire the Reader to consider how these three parts of this our native sin do produce and bring forth one another; the first, namely the guilt of *Adams* sin, being the soul cause of the other two; as these texts (beside many other) declare. *Rom.* 3. 23. *All have sinned* (that is in *Adam*)

Adam) *and come short of the glory of God, i. e.* come short of the glorious image of God, by reason of that sin of *Adams*, whereof all are guilty. And *Rom.* 5. 19. *By one mans disobedience many were made sinners.* By which one man *Adam* is understood (as all acknowledg.) And so these two texts make it clear, that childrens want of originall or primitive righteousness, and the inquination and depravation of their natures do both flow from their guilt of *Adams* sin, and are the sad consequents of it.

The Third point opened. The evident proofs of Scripture for it.

BEsides the texts already named, its plentifully taught elsewhere. *Gen.* 5. the 1. and 3. verses compared. In the first verse its said that *Adam was created in the likeness of God.* and in the 3. verse its said, that *he begat a child in his own likeness, after his image*, which imports that he begat not a child in the likeness of God, which consisted in holiness, but in the likeness of himself, who then was stained with sin.

Genes. 8. 21. *The imagination of mans heart is evill from his youth*: which text is rendered by *Junius* and *Tremellius*, *The imagination or frame of mans heart is evill from his child-hood.* Now children are free from actuall sins; and therefore the evill of their hearts must needs be originall; because all evill of sin is comprehended under one of these two sorts.

Job. 14. 4. *Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one.* Which is spoken in reference to mans birth, as its there most apparent in the first verse.

Job. 15. 14. *What is man that he should be clean? or he that is born of a woman that he should be righteous?* And again *cap.* 25. 4. *How then can man be justified with God, or how can he be clean that is born of a woman?*

The interrogations in both these texts imply an impossi-

bility that any woman ſhould bring forth a child free from the pollution and tincture of ſin in the ordinary way of conception and parturition.

Pſal. 51. 5. *Behold* (ſaith *David*) *I was ſhapen in iniquity.* If *David*, then all others, but our Saviour Chriſt onely, whoſe conception was not after the ordinary manner, but by the miraculus and incomprehenſible operation of the Holy Ghoſt.

The Anabaptiſts (to avoid the repugnancy between their Tenet and this Text) have deviſed this ſhift. They ſay, that *David* ſpake this of his mothers ſin in his conception, and not of his own ſin. But this is ſo weak a ſubterfuge and evaſion, and ſo diſſonant form the ſcope and purport of the Pſalme, that I ſhould think that any judicious man (that ſeeks the truth) ſhould bluſh to own it; for this is one of *Davids* penitentiall Pſalmes, wherein he maks humble confeſſion of his own ſins to God, and not of his mothers; and makes earneſt requeſt and ſupplication for the expiation of them, as all the precedent verſes declare. And again, though the later words in the verſe might be wreſted to be ſpoken of his mothers ſin, as well as his own, becauſe mention is made of her, yet the firſt words which are theſe; *Behold I was ſhapen in iniquity*, muſt of neceſſity be underſtood of himſelf; and can have no reference to his mother, without violence to the text, and wilfull wreſting of it.

Pſal. 58. 3. Its ſaid, *that the wicked are eſtranged from the womb.* And the like place is in *Eſa.* 48. 8. where the Lord calls the houſe of *Jacob* A tranſgreſſour from the womb, which is as much to ſay, as a ſinner by birth.

Ezech. 16. 4, 5, and 6. verſes, *Jeruſalems* nativity is affirmed by God to be polluted: and he ſaith, That he ſaw her polluted in her own blood; which text, though it ſhould be granted to be allegorical (as ſome Interpreters would have

have it) yet inevitably concludes mans birth to be unclean.

Joh. 3. 6. *That which is born of the flesh is flesh*, saith our Saviour, that is, is sinfull. For when the flesh is opposed to the Spirit (as it is here in this text) it usually denoteth, and is put to signify the pravity or sinfullness of nature: as *Gal.* 5. 17. *The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh, and these are contrary one to another.*

Roman. 5. 12. *By one man sin entred into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.* If all have sinned, then have infants sinned as well as others; for we do not find them any where excepted. Now infants have no actuall sin, while they are infants, and therefore that sin, which they are said to have, must needs be originall; all sin whatsoever being comprehended under one of these two kinds as was said before.

The Fourth point opened: namely Arguments drawn from Scripture to prove originall sin by necessary consequence.

Argument 1.

IF children be not conceived and born in sin, then is there no need of their regeneration or second birth to their salvation, before they have made themselves sinners by actuall transgression: for nothing hinders from salvation but sin.

But children have need of a regeneration or second birth to their salvation, before they have committed any actuall sin; as is clear from our Saviours words, twice affirmed with vehement asseveration *Joh.* 3. 3. and 5. *verses: Verily, verily I say unto thee, except a man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God.* And this is spoken without any exception of infants, either there or in any other place of Scripture, and is also proved by our Saviour in the verse next following to concern infants, as well as men of years; because *whatsoever is born of the flesh* (that is of fleshly and sinfull parents) *is flesh*, that is, is fleshly and sinfull, for so we

find in other places of Scripture, (as was said before) that where the flesh and the spirit are opposed one to another, (as they are in this verse) there by spirit is understood the regenerate part in man, and by flesh the unregenerate part, as (beside the former text quoted *Gal.* 5. 16. and 17. verses) is to be seen in *Rom.* 8. severall times: verse the 5. *They that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit, the things of the Spirit.* and in the next verse *to be carnally minded is death, but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. And in the* 9. verse *Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit,* and again in the 13. verse, *If ye live after the flesh ye shall dy, but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live.* In all which places, (as also in most other in the New Testament where the Spirit and the flesh are set in opposition one to another) there by flesh is meant the unregenerate part in man: unless some circumstances in the context do necessarily require that such places should be otherwise understood. Hence therefore it follows undeniably, That children are conceived and born in sin; namely, because they stand in need of regeneration to their salvation.

Argument 2.

THey that are subject to diseases and death in their conception and birth, are in their conception and birth sinfull: for these, namely diseases and death are affirmed to be the fruits and effects of sin in Scripture very frequently; *Rom.* 5. 12. *By one man sin entred into the World, and death by sin;* and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned. *Rom.* 6. 23. *The wages of sin is death.* So that where we see death or sickness seize upon any young or old, there we may surely conclude, that sin hath gone before: But infants are subject to diseases and death in their very conception and birth.

Therefore they are in their conception and birth sinfull.

To

To evade the force of this argument, one of note amongst the Anabaptists (namely one Mr. *Brown* in a Treatise which he hath penned and published, entituled, *Scripture-redemption freed from restraint*, and in page the 7. of the said discourse) restrains the death mentioned in the forenamed texts to a bodily death onely; affirming that *Adam* by his sin exposed himself and his posterity, not to eternall or the second death, to the death of soul and body both, but to bodily death onely. Yet lest he should seem to contradict Scripture (which every where affirms all sin to provoke Gods anger, and to deserve death, and to bring forth fruit unto death) he confesseth, that any sin deserves death, but not every kind of death. His words are these, I grant (saith he) that the wages of any sin is death, but the wages of any sin is not every kind of death. And so denies that *Adam* incurred any other death by his sin, than the death of the body.

Touching this answer and this exposition of the foresaid texts of Scripture, I desire the Reader to take notice of these two failings and faults therein. First it extenuates the hainousness of sin, and minceth and diminisheth that just demerit and penalty of it, which throughout the whole Scripture is denounced against it, which is death both of body and soul. Secondly its a concession and confession in effect, that children are by nature sinfull, born with sin upon them, and in them: for if the wages of any sin be death (which is truth, and he ingeniously affirms it) then where there is any death, there must needs be some sin, or else the wages and penalty of sin should be inflicted, where there is no sin.

Whereas therefore some children suffer in their infancy some kind of death, namely bodily death, they must needs be guilty of some kind of sin, otherwise they should be punished with bodily death undeservedly (which to affirm

were blasphemy) But they can have no actuall sin (as is confessed of all men) and therefore the sin which exposeth them to death must needs be some latent sin, wherewith their natures are stained from the womb, (as the Scripture speaks) which is that which we call originall. And so ye may see that his answer to the argument is in effect a confession of the unanswerable force of it, and of that which he would seeme to deny. But I will display Mr. *Brown* his grosse errour about this point yet a little further.

He confesseth in the same place of his book, *that actuall sins in men deserve eternall death, though not originall sin.* Now I would know of him; whether *Adams* first sin was not an actuall sin. This I am sure he cannot deny; Nay a very hainous actuall sin it was; as might be laid open by many circumstances. This then being granted, I demand of him; why actuall sins in us should be punishable with eternall death, and not this first hainous actuall sin of *Adam*? I dare answer for him, that he cannot tell. For if our actuall sins deserve eternall death, much rather that of *Adams*; as who had greater light, and more grace and less temptations than we have. All which considerations are so many aggravations of his sin.

Lastly, to trample this vile errour yet once more under foot, that it may never lift up it self again, I demand of these Anabaptists, whether *Adam* did not by his sin divest and disrobe himself of that glorious image of God after which he was made; which consisted especially *in righteousnes and true holiness*; as the Apostle hath declared *Eph.* 4. 22, 23, *and* 24. *verses*; for there he exhorts to *put off the old man* by which he means the vitiosity and sinfulness of our natures trasmitted and propagated into us by old *Adam*: and then to *be renewed in the spirit of our minds, and to put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousnes and true holiness*; which implyes, that Gods image, after

ter

ter which man was first created, did consist in righteousnes and holines.

Now if they deny, that *Adam* by his sin deprived himself of Gods image, consisting in righteousnes and holines; they must deny the 5. chapter of *Pauls* epistle to the *Romans* to be Canonicall Scripture; for there the Apostle affirms severall times in the five last verses that by Christ we regain both righteousnes, and life, which *Adam* lost. And again the word (*renewed* which the Scripture useth in speaking hereof) implyes a deprivation of that which was before: for nothing can properly be said to be renewed, but where there hath been a precedent deprivation of that which is renewed.

Again on the other side; if they confess that *Adam* by his sin deprived himself of Gods image; then they confess (by consequence) that his sin brought upon him spirituall death, (which is a further penalty than corporall death; and so impugneth their tenet, that *Adam* incured by his first sin no other death, than the death of the body) for as the soul gives naturall life to the body; so the image of God, namely righteousnes and holines, gives spirituall life to the soul; and without which the soul is spiritually dead, as *Ephes.* 2. 1. and *Coloss.* 2. 13. and divers other texts of Scripture witnes; where mention is made of a death in sin: *You that were dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened &c.* whence by undeniable consequence it follows, that where there is a deprivation of the spirituall life of righteousnes and holines, there must needs follow a spirituall death in sin. Now if they deny grace, righteousnes and holines to be the life of the soul, I referre them to the view of these three texts of Scripture, (omitting many other) where its expresly asserted: *Proverb.* 3. 21, 22. *Keepe sound wisdome and discretion, so shall they be life unto thy soul.* and *Rom.* 8. 6. *To be carnally minded*

is death; but to be ſpiritually minded is life. And Rom. 8. 10. *The ſpirit is life, becauſe of righteouſneſs:* that is, The ſoul is alive ſpiritually, becauſe of righteouſneſs.

Argument 3.

THey whom Chriſt came to ſave are ſinners. So ſaith our Saviour himſelf *Math.* 9. 13. *I came not to call the righteous, but ſinners to repentance.* and St. *Paul Rom.* 5. 6. *Chriſt died for the ungodly.* and. 1. *Tim.* 1. 15. *Chriſt Jeſus came into the World to ſave ſinners.* And this muſt needs be ſo in reaſon; for where there is no ſin, there is no need of a Saviour. But Chriſt came to ſave infants as well as men of years.

Therefore they are ſinners.

Now that Chriſt came to ſave infants as well as men of years, appears by Scripture theſe two wayes. 1. Becauſe he died for all men, as oft the Scripture affirms; 1. *Tim.* 2. 6. *He gave himſelf a ranſome for all. Hebr.* 2. 9. *He taſted death for every man.* For whether (all) in theſe & the like texts of Scripture be taken for all ſorts of men onely, or for all of all ſorts, infants muſt needs be included amongſt them, for they are one ſort of men. 2. Becauſe he invited children to come unto him, or to be brought unto him, as is ſaid *Mark*, 10. 14. which intimates, that he came into the World to ſave them, as well as men of years.

I will adde one argument more for proof of this point: to which the wit of man (though prompted by the cunning ſuggeſtion of the old ſerpent) cannot deviſe a ſatisfactory anſwer.

Argument. 4.

THey, which are by nature children of wrath, are by nature ſinners.

But all men are by nature children of wrath, ſo ſaith the Apoſtle *Epheſ.* 2. 3.

Therefore all men are by nature ſinners: and ſo conſequently infants.

The

The first propoſition is all that I have to prove (for th aſſumption is St *Pauls* own affirmation) And I find it the conſtant doctrine of holy Scripture, both in the old and new Teſtament, which evermore teacheth ſin to be the onely cauſe of Gods anger and wrath, And this in reaſon muſt needs be ſo; becauſe all things elſe were his own works; which were all good, yea, *very good* (as we read in *Geneſ.* 1. 31.) And ſin onely was the devils work, the enemy of God and all goodneſs; and therefore ſin onely is ſaid to provoke Gods anger, and wrath. The teſtimonies of Scripture are ſo numerous for this, that I will name but this one of a thouſand, *Rom.* 1. 18. *The wrath of God is revealed from Heaven againſt all ungodlineſs and unrighteouſneſs of men.* And how oft God is ſaid in Scripture to have been provoked to anger by the ſins of the people of *Iſrael* none can be ignorant.

I will adde but one thing more about this argument, and ſo I will conclude it.

The forenamed text in *Eph.* 2. 3. with what is deducible from it (where it is affirmed, that *we are all by nature the children of wrath*) puſleth the Anabaptiſts not a little; and puts them to their ſhifts to frame ſuch an expoſition thereof, as may impugn their own falſe tenet about originall ſin. This may appear from that expoſition, which the forementioned Mr. *Brown* hath made of that text in the 6. page of his book that I named before, where he thus expounds it. By nature (ſaith he) is underſtood; firſt the matter and form of our bodyes, which are good; and principally the light, that God hath placed in man.

Now that this is a novell, falſe, and irationall interpretation of this text, I thus diſcover. If by nature here be underſtood nothing but what is good; namely, the matter and form of our bodies, and the light that God hath placed in us: then how can it make us the children of wrath, as here its ſaid of it? for nothing thats good can make us children

of wrath. Its sin onely, (which was first brought forth by Satan) and nothing else, that provokes Gods wrath: as formerly was proved. By nature therefore in this place of necessity must be understood something that is sinfull (for else it could not make us children of wrath, as hath been shewed) which can be nothing else, but that vitiosity, pravity, and corrupt disposition, which from our first birth and being is propagated into our bodies and souls by naturall generation.

For though it were granted, that by (nature) here be meant the substance of our souls and bodyes, yet of necessity it must be also granted (as hath been now proved) that its meant of them, not as pure and free from any sin; but as vitiated and depraved therewith from their first union and conjunction together into one individuall.

It remains therefore a sure and sacred truth, inviolable and infringible; and not to be contradicted, but by obstinacy or impudence it self, That children are born in sin.

The Sixt Controversy. About Tithes.

THere is an obstreperous clamour raised against Tithes by the Anabaptisticall teachers; who yet (for the most part) lay as heavy a burthen upon their disciples; and put them to as great cost and charges, as is equivalent to Tithes: And this (in all probability) they have broached and ventilated, to get the better morsell for themselves. For this they find by experience, that the way to insinuate with the common people, and to wind themselves into their bosoms, is, to preach pleasing things unto them; and especially such as sound for their profit; be it right or wrong.

To stop their mouths, (if it may be) if not, yet to justify the practise of paying and receiving tithes, I will first make it appear, that it stands with equity and justice, that Ministers of the Gospell have allowance and recompence for performing their work of the ministery; and such an allowance,

allowance, as may afford them a competent and comfortable livelihood and subsistence.

Secondly I shall make it appear, That it stands with equity and justice, that they have tithes for their allowance.

I.

The former I shall prove both by Scripture; and by force of reason.

By Scripture I shall prove it both in the Old Testament and in the New.

First in the Old Testament. God commanded that the Levites, who were the persons set apart to attend upon the service of God in those times under the Law, as the ministers of the word are under the Gospell, should have allowance both by tithes, and other emoluments and profits out of sacrifices and oblations; (as every one knows) and moreover they had given them by Gods appointment 48. Citties with their suburbs, and land annexed and appropriated to every one of them, extending in quantity to 2000. Cubits of ground round about every Citty; as its recorded in the 35th. Chapter of the book of *Numbers* and the first verse, and so forward.

Secondly in the New Testament, our Saviour Christ sending forth his 70. disciples to preach the Gospell, bids them take neither bag, nor scrip, nor shoes, but to eate and drink with those into whose houses they entred; *for the labourer is worthy of his hire.* Luk. 10. 4, 5, 6. and 7. verses, St. *Paul* also justifies this at large and severall times, in 1. Cor. 9. 8, 10, and 11. verses he writes thus. *It is written in the Law of* Moses, *Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the Ox, that treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care for Oxen? or saith he it altogether for our sakes? for our sakes no doubt, this is written, that he that ploweth should plow in hope, and that he, that thresheth in hope, should be partaker of his hope. If*

we have ſowen unto you ſpirituall things, is it a great thing if we ſhall reap your carnall things? And then he addeth in the 13 verſe; *Do you not know that they which Miniſter about holy things live of the things of the temple? and they which waite at the altar, are partakers with the altar? even ſo hath the Lord ordained, that they which preach the Goſpell ſhould live of the Goſpell.* Here is no ambiguity nor obſcurity in this text; but a plain and punctuall affirmation, that they which preach the Goſpell ſhould have their maintenance and livelihood afforded for the preaching of it. But ſee yet further proof hereof (to beat down (if it may) that unreaſonable and unjuſt deſire that is in ſome niggardly people, who would have Miniſters do all their work and labour for nothing) *Galat. 6. 6.* The Apoſtle gives this precept; *Let him that is taught in the word, communicate to him that teacheth, in all good things.* And again in *1. Tim. 5. 17, 18.* verſes, *Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour; eſpecially they who labour in the word and doctrine.* For the Scripture ſaith, *Thou ſhalt not muzzle the Ox that treadeth out the corn; and the labourer is worthy of his reward.* Here then is plentifull proof of Scripture for the juſtification of this point.

But now ſee it proved alſo by force of reaſon; which I have learned out of Scripture alſo, namely out of *1. Corinth. 9. 7. 8. 12.* here the Apoſtle reaſons after this manner. *Who goeth a warfare any time at his own charges? who planteth a vineyard and eateth not of the fruit thereof? or who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock? Say I theſe things as a man? or ſaith not the Law the ſame alſo?* And then in the verſes following (rehearſed before) applies it to the Miniſters of the Goſpell. As if he ſhould have ſaid; Every vocation and profeſſion from the higheſt to the loweſt, from the King to the day-labourer, affords ſome emolument and recompence to them that labour in them

them: this cannot be denied. And therefore, if all other men live by their functions and callings; its just that Ministers also should live by theirs.

Again I read in Scripture; namely in 1. *Tim.* 3. 2. That *a Bishop should be hospitable*. Now if people should afford him no allowance and compensation for his labour and pains, but rather subduct that which hath been formerly given both by God (as I shall make appear hereafter) and devout men, to the support of the Ministery; I demand, (which, I know, cannot be rationally answered) by what means a Bishop should maintain hospitality. So that very reason, equity and justice claim an allowance to be yeilded to the maintenance of the Ministery.

2.

Now I shall prove, That it stands with equity and justice. That Ministers have tithes for their allowance.

And this I prove four wayes, or by 4. Arguments.

Argument 1.

First, because God himselfe appointed this payment of Tithes, first to his Ministers the Levites (as was mentioned before) in way of compensation for their worke of the Ministry. And therefore it stands with equity and justice, because it hath him for the first Author, who doth all things justly.

Argument 2.

Secondly, because the payment of Tithes hath been used and continued here in *England* many hundred yeers, by the appointment of the supreme Magistrates from time to time without any interruption, and hath been also confirmed and established by sundry lawes under the Saxon Kings of this Realm long before the Conquest; and by many Acts of Parliament, since in their severall Ages, which never yet were repealed. Who herein have followed the pattern which God had set them. So that to charge them with in-

justice herein, is both against Reason, Religion, Duty and Charity. From whence its clear, that Beneficed Ministers of the Church of *England*, in their severall respective Incumbencies, have as full, just, and legal title and claim to their Tithes, and as much right thereunto, as any Lord of a Mannour, Freeholder, or other person hath to any of the Lands or Goods whereof he standeth possessed; to wit, *Per Leges & Consuetudines Anglie.*

Wherefore seing its evident out of the Chronicles and Histories of the politick Government of this Nation, that Tithes have been so long aliened from the Layity, and dedicated and given to the maintenance of the Ministry, by those persons in supreme Power, from whom Lay-men title to their Lands, and to the other nine parts of the increase and fruits of the same was derived; its therefore contrary to all equity and reason, that they should claim any property or interest in Tithes now, who have been so long time out of possession of them, and divested of all interest and property in them.

Argument 3 d.

Thirdly, because Tithes are assigned to the Ministers in *England* by the peoples own consent and vote in Parl. For the Parliaments Vote is their Vote, the Parliament being the Representative body of all the people in the Land.

Furthermore its also to be considered, for the defence of the justice of the peoples payment of Tithes to Ministers: that seing its not nominated in the new Testament (where a compensation is allowed and enjoyned for the worke of the Ministry) what or how much this compensation or allowance shall be, therefore there was great equity that the supreme lawfull Magistrate and the Parliament should determine and appoint what it should be, as being the fittest intermediate Judges between the Ministers and the People. For it was neither fit that Ministers should have what they

would

would demand, for then (its probable) some would have too much, nor yet that people should give them but what they pleased, for then (its more then probable) they would give too little.

It remains therefore that the payment of Tithes to Ministers (as the case stands here in *England*) is both equall and just; as being justified both by the Law both of God and Man, and by the peoples own assent and vote in Parliament. And that therefore all Opposers of the same are by necessary consequence Opposers both of the Law of God, and the lawfull Magistrate, and their own Vote.

Argument 4.

I come now to a fourth and last Argument for proof of this point of the Clergies just title to Tithes; which (though it will be most cavilled at by Gainsayers, yet) to such as are truly religious and not possest with prejudice, it will be of very great force to bend and bind their Consciences to a free and a full acknowledgment of this truth.

I find in Scripture by comparing one Text with another, that God himself, in his first generall Grant to *Adam* and his posterity, of a Soveraignty over, and a free use of these inferiour creatures (mentioned *Gen.* 1. 28. did reserve a Tenth out of the fruits of the land to himself; which afterwards (namely when he had instituted a Ministeriall and Sacerdotall function, for the performance of the publike duties of his own worship and service) he gave to those that did officiate therein. And therefore to that Function they belong still, and are not alienable from it by any power on Earth, because annexed, appended, and appropriated to it by a Divine Donation.

To make good this Argument I have two things to prove. First that God reserved to himself a Tenth out of the increase and fruits of the earth, when he conferred upon *Adam* a power and property over these things below.

Secondly,

Secondly, that he assigned and gave the same Tenth to the Priesthood, for the support of his own Worship and Service.

For proofe of the former, I bring these three Texts of Scripture The First is in *Genes.* 28. 21, 22, where I find the Patriark *Jacob* vowing these two dutyes to God. 1. his faith and affiance in God, in these words; *Then shall the Lord be my God.* 2. his payment of tithe to God, in these words; *and I will surely give the tenth unto thee.* By which latter speech it appears, that the tenth of his increase was due to God. For if it be objected, that the payment of the tenth to God might be a voluntary oblation, and not a due or duty formerly belonging unto God. To this I answer, that the former branch of his vow being a necessary duty which he did owe unto God; its very improbable that this latter branch (which is coupled with it) should be a voluntary oblation, but most probable that it was a duty of right appertaining to God, as well as the other.

The 2. proof of Scripture which I produce is in *Levit.* 27. 30. Where the Lord himself speaks thus to *Moses*; *All the Tithe of the land, whether of the seed of the land, or the fruit of the tree, it is the Lords, it is holy unto the Lord.* Here we have a speciall and peculiar appropriation of Tithes to Almighty God signifyed from his own mouth.

The 3. proof is in *Malach.* 3. 8. where God again speaks after this manner. *Will a man rob God? yet ye have robbed me, but ye say, wherein have we robbed thee? in tithes and offerings.*

This appropriation of Tithes to God in both these later Texts, argues undeniably a more speciall and peculiar right and property in them; then appertains to him by his generall right of creation, which (in all probability) was a reservation of them to himself; when he granted to man a Lordship and property in and over these sublunary

and

and inferiour creatures. And these he reserved (as appeared by his disposall of them afterward) for the maintenance and support of his own solemn worship and service; as foreseeing how penurious, tenacious and strait-handed people would be in contributing to the support and furtherance of the same.

And that this is so, may more clearly appear these two wayes, or by these two considerations. First, because this claim was made by God, before his institution of the Leviticall function, to which he gave the tithes afterwards; so that God could not then claim them in any reference to the Levites (as otherwise might have been supposed) because they were not appointed to their sacerdotall office till afterwards, as is manifested by the story following in the first and third chapters of the book of *Numbers*; where their first institution is recorded.

2

Secondly, because God could not have claimed them as his own in this distinct way and sense from the rest; if he had given them before to *Adam*. And therefore this peculiar claim and property, which God chalengeth to tithes (which is in effect a deniall of them to belong to man) speaketh his reservation of them to himself, when he first passed his originall grant of all things here below to *Adam*.

2. Secondly, I have yet to prove, that God gave these tithes (which he had reserved to himself) to the Priests and Levites. And this I prove by 3. texts of Scripture.

First I read in *Genes.* 14. 18, 19, *and* 20. *verses, that when Melchizedek the Priest of the most high God had blessed the Patriark Abraham, he gave him tithes of all*, that is, *Abraham* gave *Melchizedek* the Priest the tenth of the spoyls that he had gotten in a battle, as its expressed *Hebr.* 7. 4. This we may not imagin to be done by *Abraham* without speciall warrant from God (though the Scripture makes no

mention thereof) as who is so highly commended in Scripture for his faith and upright walking with God.

And by this fact it appears, that God appointed tithes to be given to his Priests: this being the first mention that is made of them in Scripture. Secondly, its clearly proved by a manifest of Gods donation of tithes to the Levites in *Numb.* 18. 21, 24, 25. and 26. verses, where the Lord tells *Aaron* three several times, *that he had given the tithe of the children of Israel to the Levites.*

Thirdly, its affirmed by the Apostle *Hebr.* 7. 5. where we find it thus written. *And verily they that are of the sons of Levi, who receive the office of the Priesthood, have a commandment to take tithes of the people according to the Law.*

Now from the premises I collect, that tithes are due to Gods Ministers by divine right; as who have a just title unto them by a speciall donation and grant from God himself; to whom they primitively belonged, as hath been demonstrated. And that therefore to alienate them from the Ministry, and to put them into the hands of the Laity, is apparent and manifest sacriledg.

I will make a short answer to the ridiculous objections of some irrationall, unjust, and covetous people against the payment of tithes, and so conclude.

1. *Objection.*

First some say, that Ministers should take nothing for their labour; because our Saviour said to his Apostles; Freely ye have received freely give, Mat. 10. 8.

1. *Answ.*

To this I answer first, that our Saviour spake these words to his twelve Apostles, to whom he gave commission and command to go and preach the Gospell to all the World, as its recorded *Mark.* 16. 15. So that they could have no leasure to stay in any one place so long, as to gather tithes, having so great a journey to travell.

2. *Answ.*

2. *Answ.*

Secondly I answer, that he bad them not onely to preach, but to heal the sick, raise the dead, and cast out devils; and then said, *Freely ye have received, freely give*, because to do such miraculous works, as to *heal their sick*, and *cast out devils* and *raise their dead*, he knew that the people would be hasty to give large moneys: and therefore he commanded his Apostles to do such miracles freely, lest through avarice they should abuse his free grace to their own private gain. And that he meant not to forbid them to take any reward for preaching (though they took nothing for working miracles) is apparent from the two next verses following; where he subjoynes these speeches: *Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses, nor scrip for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves; for the workman is worthy of his meat.* By which speeches he approves of their receiving of meat and other such needfull things before named from such to whom they preached the Gospell: for otherwise he would not have forbiden them the provision of such necessaryes, without which they could not subsist.

2. *Objection.*

Some again object and say; *that Ministers should not preach for money.*

1. *Answ.*

To this I return a double answer also. First I say, that yet they are not bound to preach for nothing; unless they could live (like Chamelions without meat) This I have sufficiently proved before.

2. *Answ.*

Secondly I answer, that in some sense they are not to preach for money; that is, as the onely and cheif end of their preaching; for the cheif end of preaching is the glory of God, and the edification of the body of Christ; and the salvation of men; which every faithfull preacher especi-

ally aims at. But yet in some sense again they may preach for money; that is as deserving and expecting money, as a due reward of their pains, and the means of their maintenance and subsistence.

Having now finished what I propounded to discusse and debate; I will tire the Reader with no further discourse; but wind up all with an apology for my self; in presuming to publish this plain and impolisht canvise, and discussion of these old controversies, (now newly revived) which have been so largely and learnedly disputed and discussed by many great schollars, and divines of exquisite and profound learning in former ages.

All that I have to plead for my self (besides what I premised in my Epistle to the Reader) is this. *That by the mouth of more witnesses, every truth may still be more established.*

FINIS.

A SHORT TREATISE

of politike power, and of the true obedience which Subjects owe to Kings and other civill GOVERNOURS.

CHAP. I.

Whereof politike power groweth, wherefore it was ordained, and the right use and duty of the same.

CHAP. II.

Whether Kings, Princes, and other Governours have an absolute power and authority over their Subjects.

CHAP. III.

Whether Kings, Princes, and other politike Governours be subject to Gods Law, and the positive laws of their Countries.

CHAP. IV.

In what things, and how farre Subjects are bound to obey their Princes and Governours.

CHAP. V.

Whether all the Subjects goods be the Emperours or Kings own, and that they may lawfully take them as their owne.

CHAP. VI.

Whether it be lawfull to depose an evill Governour, and kill a Tyrant.

CHAP. VII.

What confidence is to be given to Princes and Potentates.

Composed by me D. I. P. B. R. W.

PSAL. 118.

It is better to trust in the Lord, then to trust in Princes.

BIBL. CANT. ACAD.

Printed in the year 1556. and now reprinted 1639.

ally aims at. But yet in some sense again they may preach for money; that is as deserving and expecting money, as a due reward of their pains, and the means of their maintenance and subsistence.

Having now finished what I propounded to discusse and debate; I will tire the Reader with no further discourse; but wind up all with an apology for my self; in presuming to publish this plain and impolisht canvise, and discussion of these old controversies, (now newly revived) which have been so largely and learnedly disputed and discussed by many great schollars, and divines of exquisite and profound learning in former ages.

All that I have to plead for my self (besides what I premised in my Epistle to the Reader) is this. *That by the mouth of more witnesses, every truth may still be more established.*

FINIS.